

University of Montana ScholarWorks at University of Montana

Mike Mansfield Speeches

Mike Mansfield Papers

8-13-1966

Operation Bold (Blast Off Libby Dam)

Mike Mansfield 1903-2001

Let us know how access to this document benefits you.

Follow this and additional works at: https://scholarworks.umt.edu/mansfield_speeches

Recommended Citation

Mansfield, Mike 1903-2001, "Operation Bold (Blast Off Libby Dam)" (1966). *Mike Mansfield Speeches*. 628.
https://scholarworks.umt.edu/mansfield_speeches/628

This Speech is brought to you for free and open access by the Mike Mansfield Papers at ScholarWorks at University of Montana. It has been accepted for inclusion in Mike Mansfield Speeches by an authorized administrator of ScholarWorks at University of Montana. For more information, please contact scholarworks@mso.umt.edu.

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE APPROPRIATIONS, 1967

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business.

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H.R. 15941) making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967, and for other purposes.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The bill is open to amendment.

Mr. RUSSELL of Georgia. Mr. President, for myself and for the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL], I send to the desk an amendment and ask to have it reported.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment will be stated.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

Page 3, line 21, after "1967" insert:

Provided further, That notwithstanding any other provision of law, until June 30, 1968, the President may order any member in the Ready Reserve of an armed force, who has not served on active duty other than for training, to active duty for not more than 18 consecutive months: *Provided further*, That in order to achieve fair treatment as between members in the Ready Reserve who are being considered for active duty under this section consideration shall be given to—

(a) family responsibilities; and

(b) employment necessary to maintain the national health, safety, or interest

Mr. RUSSELL of Georgia. Mr. President, this amendment is short, concise, and clear. It grants the President of the United States the authority to order to active duty any member of the Ready Reserve of any of the Armed Forces of the United States who has not served on active duty other than for training heretofore.

At the outset I wish to say that this amendment is not intended in any way to reflect on the members of the Reserve forces of this country. Unfortunately, news accounts of my statement or my interviews with reporters after the committee reported the bill, indicated that I said all of the 133,000 men who had not been trained, the so-called REP's in the Reserve enlisted program, were seeking to escape the dangers and hardships of war, and that it was some kind of scandal.

I never made such a statement and I did not intend to infer that such was the case.

I did state and I repeat here that there have been individual cases that amount to a scandal where people have undertaken to avoid active duty in the regular forces by finding places in the Reserve units. They are in a great minority, and their action can in no wise be at-

tributed to the great mass of Reserve forces.

I recall distinctly in this same interview that I stated I was not reflecting on the entire Reserve; that I had always supported the Reserves. Unfortunately, that portion of my statement was omitted from the news account.

The Reserve organizations of this country are not responsible for the conditions which exist today. They have been a bulwark of strength in every period of danger that this Nation has ever met and the overwhelming mass of them are ready and willing to serve in this or in any other emergency that threatens the security and welfare of our Nation.

Mr. President, this amendment is offered for two reasons. In the first place, I am seeking to bring about as nearly as possible, an equality of service to our Nation in time of war.

This cannot be done under existing conditions when the Reserves assigned to units are not subject to call except on the basis of unit callup. I have always supported universal military training. I believe that every young man in this Nation who is physically able to do so, should have 6 months of active military training; and until we do adopt such a policy, Mr. President, we will not be able to avoid the allegations of favoritism, and the difficulties which arise because some men are able to go to college and others are not.

I am very proud of the fact that on one occasion in my career, perhaps the hardest legislative fight in which I was ever engaged, was the one in which the Senate adopted by the margin of 1 vote a bill providing for universal military training for every young American when he became 18 years old. The bill died in the other body. I still say that without that type of legislation, we will never find an equitable method of distributing service under the colors of the United States and in the uniform of the United States.

All of us are familiar with the fact that the minimum physical and mental requirements for duty in the Reserves and in the National Guard are higher than they are for Selective Service. Therefore, the men who are isolated from the war by virtue of being in the Reserve units are, on the average, superior mentally and physically to those being drafted and sent to Vietnam.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Georgia yield for a question?

Mr. RUSSELL of Georgia. I am happy to yield to the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I should like to have the Senator explain to me just what are the different categories of individuals in the Reserves. I have my own knowledge, of course, but I should like to get corroboration—that is, I know there are men in the Reserves who served in World War II. Is that not correct?

Mr. RUSSELL of Georgia. That is correct.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Also volunteer enlistees in the Reserves who have never served in war.

Mr. RUSSELL of Georgia. Never been on active duty at any time in the regular forces, other than for training.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Then there is a third class, men who have served recently, and as a part of their service go into the Reserves when they are separated from the regular service.

Mr. RUSSELL of Georgia. The Senator is correct. Perhaps the largest unit of the Ready Reserves is comprised of those men who have been drafted and who have served 2 years, or 21 months, in some instances, but who still have a 4-year obligation in the Ready Reserves. That is the largest body of men in the Reserves. They are specifically exempted by this amendment, because they have already served their draft period. They are not subject to call up under this amendment. They will be called only if their entire Reserve unit is ordered into active duty. That is the reason I am offering this amendment; because it is much fairer than the unit call. I have described one group. As to the next, if a man enlisted for 3 years in the Regular Army, when he completes his term of service of 3 years, he then has a 3-year obligation in the Ready Reserves. There are quite a large number of these men.

In addition, there are a number of what might be called career reservists. Some of them served, as the Senator has said, in World War II, although not many of them. Quite a large number served in the Korean conflict, and they are now in the Reserves because they like the military duty. They are, of course, building up their retirement.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Yes.

Mr. RUSSELL of Georgia. They are receiving drill pay and building up their retirement benefits by continuing to stay in the Reserves.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Is it fair to say that the premise for the Senator's proposal is that in the main there are two divisions in the Reserves, one, those who have actively served in the military forces and, two, those who voluntarily enlisted in the Reserves but have never served—

Mr. RUSSELL of Georgia. Have never been on active duty other than for training.

Mr. RUSSELL of Georgia. Mr. President, I desire to say a few words. The inference might be drawn that I am antagonistic to the Reserve components of the military services.

Let me say that I can point to a record of more than 30 years in this body to demonstrate my support, in and out of season, of all of the Reserve components. I believe in the Reserve concept. That support has been given when it was not easy to give. It has been given at times when it was difficult to convince people of the necessity for substantial armed forces of any kind.

I have been, and I am today, a friend of the Reserve components of our Military Establishment. I hope, however, Mr. President, that I will never permit that support, which is deep and genuine, to sweep me away from objectivity in dealing with our military problems.

Mr. President, throughout the years, I have participated in the enactment of every law which has increased the military strength of this country. We have built up a strong Reserve, and I have offered some of the provisions to the basic military legislation which has provided for this Reserve. I have supported legislation at times when the Nation was not at war, as it is today, which required that young men who had already done their military duty, in times of peace, remain in the Reserve components of the Military Establishment for 4 years or more. At one time the requirement for availability was 8 years. That is the backbone of the Reserve power today, despite what anyone in his misguided enthusiasm may say about it.

The distinguished Senator from South Carolina, says that all they have to do is to call up a unit. Mr. President, even if it were advisable to do so, that statement is not correct. Under the laws of the United States, we cannot call up a unit unless the President declares a national emergency.

There are sound reasons why the President prefers not to declare a national emergency at this time. It would certainly contribute nothing to our international relations. Despite the fact that the war in which we are now

engaged has, in fact, escalated, we have sought, in and out of season, to arrange for some meeting with our adversaries to arrive at a peace agreement. We have assiduously sought to convince the rest of the world that we have no intention to initiate a gigantic buildup on the mainland of Asia. We have repeatedly stated that our only intention is to make certain that the people of South Vietnam are permitted to determine the form of government under which they wish to live and operate.

Accordingly, it is not correct to say that all we have to do is to call up a unit. Even if that were correct, it would be of very doubtful equity to call up a unit. If we did so, we would be calling up men who have already fought in one war and sending them out to fight again.

Mr. President, I served in this body during the Korean war, and in the solitude of my room I wept tears because we had to man the Army almost exclusively with officers who had fought on the battlefields of Europe and in the Pacific in World War II.

They were the only ones available. They were men who had fought in World War II. They had married. They had started rearing families. Many of them had started little businesses. All were striving to advance. And we called them up and sent them to Korea, taking them away from their wives and children, causing them to lose property and businesses, because we had no other trained men available.

I have worked from that day to this to make sure that there would be no repetition of that. When our Nation is in danger from all-out war, of course everybody has to do his duty, whether he served in one or two or three wars. But in a war of the proportions such as the one we are engaged in, or when we were engaged in the war in Korea, there is no justification for this situation. I do not

care what kind of statements we get from the National Guard Association or Reserve Officers' Association. There is no justification for calling up men who have served their country to fight in one war, or who have fought in two wars, leaving thousands behind who have not fought in any war. That is what my amendment is designed to prevent.

I care not how many associations or people or Reserve officers' groups take a contrary position; in my own heart, I do not believe you can justify it and be honest by saying we should go back to the unit concept.

It has been said 316,000 would be dragged out of the National Guard. We have to entrust somebody with this responsibility. The Commander in Chief of the Armed Forces happens to be at this time Lyndon B. Johnson. Whether you like him or dislike him, he is the Commander in Chief. If you think he is going to do anything that foolish, your remedy ought not to be to vote against this amendment that I have offered, but you ought to be going around seeking some means of impeaching him and removing him from office.

Of course, the President would not do any such thing. It is absolutely silly to argue that he is going to call up the 316,000 in the National Guard. He is

interested in the defense of the country. He is the Commander in Chief.

What I am trying to do is contribute what I can to prevent a repetition of what happened in Korea, when we called up men, by units, who had already fought in a war. Many of them had been wounded. They were forced to leave behind the efforts of their toil—the progress they had made—in the few years since they had fought in World War II because there were no other men to take their place.

I say these men who have been in training ought to be subject to call if the Commander in Chief says they are needed. Senators may take the other position; I am going to stand by mine because I know in my own heart I am right, and I know it is only the special interests that could possibly oppose any proposition of this kind.

We could go ahead and fight the war without adopting the amendment, but we will wind up with practically every man subject to the draft. We will have standards lowered when we draft those men, because we are taking 40,000 to 47,000 a month. They will include men who are less qualified physically, who are not as mentally endowed as the men in the Reserves, because the Reserves have higher standards. We will not have those men available to fight the war or to fill the cadres in Europe as long as we have this mantle of protection by Congress. I am not blaming the men; it is Congress who has put this mantle of protection around those who have not served one minute of their lives in the service of their country—except perhaps for some training duty—men who are in the bloom of their youth, at the height of their strength, and who have high endowments both mentally and physically.

Mr. President, I cannot see how any realistic answer can be raised against this amendment. They say, "You can call up the units." In the first place, it cannot be done, because the President of the United States has to declare a national emergency, and very naturally he does not want to declare a national emergency at this time after we have gone this far without it. If he had called it initially, I do not think it would have made much difference, but after we have waged this war for this long, a declaration of a national emergency would make us look ridiculous in the eyes of the world—to declare a state of emergency in regard to a third-rate power like North Vietnam.

My amendment is an opportunity to contribute to the cause of equality. I do not know whether the President of the United States will use it or not. I have never discussed it with him. But that does not excuse me from trying to remove an inequality in the law. The National Guard Association may be opposed to this, but they have a floor of 380,000, and there are 421,000 in the National Guard today. They are 41,000 above the strength provided for.

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. Mr. President, will the Senator from Georgia yield?

Mr. RUSSELL of Georgia. I yield.

Mr. RUSSELL of Georgia. I always try to deal absolutely fairly with the Senate. I have no assurances that this amendment would be applied at all. I have never discussed it with the President or with the Secretary of Defense. As to the callup of troops, it may not be used at all.

If they do apply it, in my opinion, they will call men from the Reserve units whose military occupational specialty—that is, the MOS—is in short supply in Vietnam, and the men who have these specialties will be able to help there. In addition, men who have any other special skills, such as the Senator from Louisiana pointed out, in the construction of warehouses or in the construction of port facilities might be called up. They might call up some men who had skill in engineering. I cannot conceive of doing that with a large number of foot soldiers or infantrymen. I am quite confident that they would not, but it would open up this field to a point which, if there were any personnel who had a specialty which could assist the men who are in Vietnam, the President could call them up and send them over to help.